



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica. Essays chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism by Members of the University of Oxford. Vols. II and III. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1890 and 1891. 8vo, pp. viii, 324 and one facsimile; and pp. viii, 325 and five facsimiles.

The second and third series of essays published under the direction of Professors Driver, Cheyne and Sanday, of Oxford University, well maintain the high standard set by the first.¹ They appeal only to scholars. There are in English, besides the recent 'Texts and Studies,' edited by J. Rendel Harris and J. Armitage Robinson, so few publications of this kind, that every encouragement should be given to the editors and promoters of this valuable series. New Testament textual criticism receives the largest share of attention, five of the thirteen articles being concerned with it. Two papers treat patristic subjects; one the Synoptic Problem; two the Canons of the Old and New Testament, and two others the Old Testament.

The first paper is an inquiry, by Dr. Ad. Neubauer, into the Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms according to the early Jewish authorities. Beginning with the Septuagint translators and the Targums down to Immanuel ben Solomon of Rome (Manuelo, the friend of Dante), it brings out clearly the extreme conservatism of Jewish tradition as to the authorship and its entire ignorance of the meaning of the titles of the Psalms. "It is evident that the meaning of them was early lost. Our only remaining resource is the critical method, which, however, on the present subject has as yet made no considerable progress" (p. 57). As might have been expected from its authorship, it is a learned and interesting contribution to a subject which, in former times, has greatly exercised Biblical students. The Hebrew titles to the Psalms were considered as supplying a key not only to the age and authorship of those compositions, but also to the music to which they were chanted, and many a superstructure of ingenious guesswork has been erected on this basis. The Psalms discussed are Nos. 3-9, 16, 22, 32, 33, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 53, 56, 60, 69, 70, 75, 77, 80, 81, 87-90, 92, 103, 126, 127.

Mr. F. H. Woods discusses the Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels (pp. 59-104), without, however, attempting to exhaust the subject in the brief space allotted to him. He tries to show that the original basis of the Synoptic Gospels coincided in its *range* and *order* almost exactly with our St. Mark, excluding, of course, Chapter XVI 9-20. For this he adduces six reasons of varying strength and incisiveness, the accumulative force of which it is almost impossible to withstand. His method is cautious and his statements are guarded. He reaches conclusions which are practically identical with those of Heinrich Holtzmann in his 'Synoptische Evangelien' (Vol. I of 'Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament,' Freiburg, 1889). "There are a

¹ See A. J. P. VII 92-96.

few unimportant passages where it is not unlikely, and yet by no means certain, that St. Mark modified the earlier tradition; one only where it is almost certain that he did so, viz. in the omission of Matth. iii. 7-10, 12; and there are some grounds for thinking that the Marcian tradition (or perhaps we should say St. Mark) originally contained what corresponded to Matth. xxviii. 9, 10, 16-20. We conclude, therefore, that the common tradition upon which all the three Synoptics were based is substantially our St. Mark as far as *matter, general form* and *order* are concerned. Whether we can go further, and say that in point of language and the more minute details it is generally identical, is a further question which we have not attempted to settle." To add to the merits of his essay, Woods has appended an excellent synoptic table showing the relation between St. Mark and the other Synoptic Gospels. It is one of the best introductions to the comparative study of the Gospels, and throws no small light on the principles of selection which, it is obvious, governed their composition.

C. H. Turner's paper on the Day and Year of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom (pp. 105-55) is a subject which had been treated by Randell in the first volume of these studies and by the late Bishop Lightfoot in his great work on Ignatius and Polycarp. The paper is acute and ingenious, and offers an alternative to Lightfoot's 23d February, 155, in the 22d February, 156 A. D. The whole argument depends on the not improbable assumption that 'the great Sabbath' belongs to Purim, and the author's idea is that 156 was a leap-year, that the extra day was intercalated at the beginning of Xanthicus, giving it two seconds as well as its (normal) two firsts, so that in that year the (first) second of Xanthicus fell on February 22d. Turner also assumes an error in synchronism due either to the original writer or a later scribe from the use of a hemerology which did not indicate the leap-year; hence the textual 23d February. Two appendices treat (1) on a Paschal Homily printed in St. Chrysostom's Works, ascribed by Ussher to A. D. 672, but really belonging to A. D. 387, and (2) passages from ancient writers who employ kalendars of the Asiatic type, giving side by side a Roman and a native dating.

The next contribution is an essay by Dr. Bigg on the Clementine Homilies (pp. 157-93). It is a most valuable paper, although the author does not discuss the relation between these and the Recognitions. The real aim is to show that the Homilies were made up of a recast by an Arian Christian of Syriac nationality, turned Ebionite, of an orthodox *Grundschrift*, which formed the original basis of all the Clementine writings (p. 175). The catholic original Bigg dates to about 200 A. D. (p. 183). The recasting was done at some early period in the fourth century. "If we suppose that we have in the present *Homilies* the production of an Arian Christian of Syriac nationality, who fancied that he found in Ebionitism a solution of the great problem—a historical and quasi-philosophical doctrine of the Arian Saviour—we should not perhaps go far wrong. And nowhere could such a man be looked for with more prospect of success than in Antioch" (p. 192).

An excellent article is that of J. M. Bebb on the Evidence of the early versions and Patristic quotations on the text of the books of the New Testament (pp. 195-240). It is less an account of results than of methods and principles, discussing, among others, (1) obvious scribes' errors in the language of

the versions, or misreading of the Greek; (2) corruptions to suit a familiar text, or adaptations to other authorities, and (3) formal changes in style and diction.

G. H. Gwilliam devotes his paper to an account of the Ammonian sections, Eusebian Canons, and Harmonizing Tables in the Syriac Tetraevangelium (pp. 241-72). It was generally known that also the Peshitto MSS exhibit these sections and canons; the printed editions, however, have thus far not indicated these accessories of the text, and very few had an accurate knowledge of them. The argument which the writer develops at the end of his paper (pp. 265-6) from the care the Syrians bestowed on these accessories to their text, to prove the relative originality of the text that underlies the Peshitto, is open to the destructive objections of Dr. Sanday on p. 272.

The closing essay of the second volume is a very acceptable account by Mr. H. J. White of the brilliant series of investigations and studies, carried on especially in the London Academy from 1887 to 1889, which have resulted in restoring to us the history of the great Codex Amiatinus of the Vulgate. Contrary to the view of Lagarde,¹ who dated the codex in the ninth century, White, following de Rossi and Hort, fixes the date to the middle or, at the latest, to the second half of the sixth century. The whole précis was worth giving, and few could have put it together better.

Of the greatest interest for the philologist is Dr. Sanday's note on the Italian origin of the Codex Amiatinus and the localizing of Italian MSS. He discusses with great acumen and thoroughness the list of peculiarities in Late Latinity put forward by Dr. Hamann² as marks of Italian origin. Such are $s = x$: *senes* for *senex*, *senia* for *xenia* (ξένια). Though there is sufficient evidence of the prevalence of this corruption in Italy, there is also reason to think that it existed in Africa, and there is satisfactory proof of its existence in Gaul. *N* inserted: *gigans*, *optimantium*. In Gregory of Tours we find *accensus* (= *accessus*), perhaps from confusion with *ascensus*. On the whole, the view that this inserted *n* favors an Italian origin seems, if not proved, yet perhaps rather more probable than not. $Cx = x$: *anxius*, *unx̄it*, *sanx̄it* (Gregory of Tours). The wide diffusion of this usage will not be disputed. There is hardly one of the Latin-speaking provinces from which there is not an evidence for it. *Sub* assimilated before *s* and *ad* before *m*: *sussaltastis*, *ammirata*. Instances of the former assimilation are comparatively rare, and all of Italian origin. The assimilation both of *sub* and *ad* before *m* is more common; so also of *in* before *m*; only once do we find it in Gregory of Tours: *amminiculo*. Taking all the evidence together, a better case appears to be made out than we have as yet had. There is a presumption that the less usual forms of assimilation are Italian. $A = au$: *agusto*, *atem*. The grammarian Caper lays down *auscultā non auscultā* (ed. Keil, VII.108), which shows that both forms were current. And if, turning to modern usage, it is argued that the Italian form is 'Agostino,' it may be replied that the Spanish is also 'Agustín.' $O = au$: *clodus* is no doubt the vernacular spelling. Gregory of Tours certainly wrote so, as well as Venantius Fortunatus; it was current also in Africa. $U = au$: the forms *clusi* for *clausi*, *clusum* for *clausum* are also very widely diffused. $A = e$: cf. *adtractaverit* (Codex Amiatinus) and *contractans*

¹ London Academy, Sept. 2, 1882, and Mittheilungen, Vol. I, 191-2.

² London Academy, May 7, 1887.

(Gregory of Tours). *E = i*: *redemet* (= redimet). Numbers of such cases might be quoted from the inscriptions or MSS of every region. *Vowel prefixed to s impure*: *histriatarum* (= striatarum). It is not rare in Romance countries. Gregory of Tours has several examples, and noteworthy is the *hispatii* of the Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta. The converse case of *Spania* for *Hispania* is of frequent occurrence. *S = ex*: e. g. (*e*)*spendebat* and *scandescet*. Cod. Bezae (D Evv.) offers many analogies, as *sconspectu* = *ex conspectu*. The common view assigns this remarkable codex to the south of France. In favor of this would be the curious form *sonium* (= μέριμνα, Luke 21, 34), which is naturally compared with 'soin.' *Ph = p* and *di = z*: thus *tophadius* (= topazus). The dropping of *m* is too common to furnish any criterion. There are many examples in the Spanish and African inscriptions, besides those in Italy. The only books which deal directly with this subject are Sittl's *Lokale Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache* (Erlangen, 1882) and Max Bonnet, *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours* (1890).¹

The third volume followed rapidly upon the second. The contributors are mainly those whose names are associated with the previous volumes.

Dr. Neubauer again opens the series with a paper on the Introduction of the Square Characters in Biblical MSS and an Account of the Earliest MSS of the Old Testament. The Assyrians, we know, were well acquainted with the art of writing as early as the XVth century B. C. The El-Amarna inscriptions, dating about 1400 B. C., make reference to Palestinian cities. The Moabites knew that art in the ninth century B. C., and so the Israelites possessed books in the time of Samuel, and probably used writing with some freedom at a somewhat earlier date. דען, the term for the Old Ibrī, is derived by Neubauer from a root *d'-g*, to fix in, to engrave, following Epiphanius, who says that the Pentateuch was written 'forma Hebraei *deession*, quod interpretatur: insculptum.' I am surprised to see no notice of de Lagarde's² view that כתב דען is probably to be interpreted as 'the cuneiform writing,' and דען the Hebrew transliteration of Assyrian *diš* (*dis*), the name of the single perpendicular wedge. This opinion of Lagarde is strengthened by the fact that the Babylonian Hisdai calls the Old Ibrī לִיבֹנַי (*Libonai*), which means 'on brick,' perhaps because the Babylonian rabbi knew the Old Ibrī characters from inscriptions on bricks. The square characters are called 'Assyrian' because the Jews brought them from Assyria, *i. e.* Mesopotamia.

"The tradition is pretty well established that a new form of writing was introduced after the Exile for copying Scripture, and the early tradition attributed it to Ezra. Now, there is no reason why we should not agree with this tradition of the rabbis and the early Christian fathers. There is in fact nothing else possible but to admit that the Pentateuch (for this book was the first to be multiplied by copies) was simultaneously written in the Old Ibrī and in the Aramaic characters before either of them was declared sacred" (p. 13). But is there any positive value to be attributed to this so-called 'tradition'? Mr. Neubauer certainly does not convince us of it. As for the other Biblical books, he says (p. 14): "We believe that they were written in Aramaic characters solely from the beginning, since no early use was made of them in the service of the Temple, and they were not the object of exegesis in the schools

¹ See A. J. P. XII 221.

² *Armenische Studien*, p. 154, rem.

of the priests." Very interesting is the author's account of the earliest MSS of the Old Testament, illustrated, as it is, by four admirable photographic facsimiles, enabling those who are not skilled in palaeography to understand the grounds on which, for example, the date of the Codex Babylonicus of 916 is determined.¹

Canon Gore's exposition of the argument of Romans IX-XI (pp. 37-46) is not satisfactory, owing to its aphoristic brevity. Although ingenious in its character and well written, it leaves the problem as dark as ever.

G. H. Gwilliam's *Materials for the Criticism of the Peshitto New Testament*, with specimens of the Syriac Massorah, are learned prolegomena for a future critical edition, and constitute a valuable addition to our means of ascertaining the relative importance of the Syriac versions. The Karkaphensian version is discussed and further reasons brought forward by the author for his opinion that the Peshitto, and not the Curetonian, represents the 'Old Syriac.' The paper is full of suggestions, and the point seems to be proved that the present Peshitto is not the gradually formed product of several successive revisions.

The next contribution, which is an *Examination of the New Testament Quotations of Ephrem Syrus*, by F. H. Woods (pp. 105-38), has as important a bearing on critical questions affecting the canon and text of the New Testament as Mr. Gwilliam's paper. Mr. Woods shows that while some of these quotations are in exact or practical agreement with the Peshitto, others indicate the existence and use of an extra-Peshitto Syriac text, while a third class point to a direct or indirect use of a Greek text (p. 116 foll.). Ephrem himself may have known Greek, and used a Greek text or a Syriac MS with variant Greek readings, or he may have availed himself of the assistance of a Graeco-Syriac scholar. It is amusing to notice that, following immediately upon Mr. Gwilliam's paper, our author writes: "The Curetonian version is now generally believed to be a fragment of the original Syriac version, and the Peshitto merely a later recension of the same, influenced by what are technically called Syriac readings."

The *Text of the Canons of Ancyra* is studied by Mr. R. B. Rackham (pp. 139-216). The writer shows that it is impossible at present to get at the original text and that there are great difficulties in coming to an approximate certainty. But he faces these difficulties with the greatest pains and diligence, for which he deserves hearty recognition. He gives a new critical edition of the Greek text of these canons (pp. 142-54), with numerous variant readings and a minute description of the MSS, prefaced by a list of them (pp. 139-42). Then follows an essay (pp. 143-94) containing critical and explanatory notes. Two appendices give the Latin translation of the Syriac and the Armenian versions, the latter kindly made for the author by Mr. Conybeare, of University College, from a MS in his own possession.

Dr. Sanday closes this series with a long study on the Cheltenham List of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament and of the writings of Cyprian (pp. 217-303). This list was discovered in the Philipps Collection at Cheltenham by Professor Mommsen in 1885, and published by him in *Hermes*, XXI (1886), pp. 142-56. The MS itself is of the tenth century, but the list,

¹ Also see *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January, 1892, pp. 317, 318; and *London Academy*, April 2, 1892, p. 328 fol.

according to Mommsen, belongs to the year 359 A. D. Hence its importance. Sanday gives an exhaustive discussion of all the points affecting the canon of the Old and New Testament. He reprints the list from Mommsen's article, reproducing the Latinity and clerical errors of the MS, and then continues with some valuable contributions: (1) To the history of the canon and order of the Old Testament. "Speaking summarily, we may say that the conspicuous features in the Cheltenham List are its points of contact with St. Augustine and its marked coincidence with St. Jerome as to the number of the Books, which may, however, have had an earlier origin" (p. 243); (2) To the canon and order of the books of the New Testament. The salient points of the New Testament list are: (a) the omission of Hebrews and the inclusion of the Apocalypse, points marking this list at once as Western; (b) the abridged list of Catholic Epistles: omitting James and Jude; (c) the order of these Epistles: that (or rather those) of St. John being the first, immediately following the Apocalypse; (d) the order of the Gospels: Matth., John, Luke and Mark; (e) the order of the different parts of the collection: Evv., Epp. Paul., Act., Apoc., Cath. Epp.; (3) Notes on the Stichometries of the Biblical Books, with due reference to the articles of Professor Rendel Harris in A. J. P., 1883 ff., and (4) the list of the writings of Cyprian. It is needless to say that the author's characteristic learning and caution are illustrated on every page. Fresh light is thrown on the history of the Canon, and the five Comparative Tables (pp. 227-32, 254-57, 266-69, 283-87, 299 f.) will be found useful by all students. It is a pity that Sanday, at the time when he published this essay, had not yet seen Mommsen's recent note in *Hermes*, XXV (1890), pp. 636-38: *Zur lateinischen Stichometrie*, in which he discusses the MS of St. Gall, No. 133, also containing this same list of the Books of the Bible and the writings of Cyprian. A comparison of the two lists would have been very interesting and fruitful.

An appendix (pp. 304-23) contains remarks by C. H. Turner on the stichometry of the Cheltenham List and more particularly on that of Cyprian's works. These notes correct and modify somewhat several of Dr. Sanday's statements, and show great judgment and skill.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

Historische Grammatik der Hellenischen Sprache oder Uebersicht des Entwicklungsganges der altgriechischen zu den neugriechischen Formen, nebst einer kurzen Geschichte der mittleren und neuesten Litteratur, mit Sprachproben und metrischen Uebersetzungen, von Dr. H. C. MÜLLER, Privatdozent a. d. Universität von Amsterdam. (Erster Band, Grammatik.) Leiden, 1891.

The title of this book promises more, much more, than could be fulfilled at present. But the book is welcome and suggestive. It is something to be able to register the continuous existence of 'Greek' from 1000 B. C. to the present day. The most obvious criticism is that the 'common' speech is throughout subordinated to the written language or 'Hochsprache,' and that the book partakes too largely of the nature of a special plea for substituting modern Greek, and the modern pronunciation with it, for the ancient Greek in elementary instruction. This special plea and the somewhat extravagant